



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

MTC Advisory Council  
January 14, 2009  
**Minutes**

Cathy Jackson called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. In attendance were members Wendy Alfsen, John Cockle, Paul Cohen, Angela Columbo, Raphael Durr, Rita Foti, David Grant, Mary Griffin, William Hastings, Richard Hedges, Kathryn Hughes, Julio Lacayo, Sherman Lewis, Michael Pechner, and Don Rothblatt. Commissioner Giacopini also was in attendance.

**Minutes**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Public Comment**

No comment.

**Staff Report**

Ms. Therese Knudsen welcomed the new Engineering Advisor, Ms. Rita Foti. She also noted that, due to his new role as Mountain View City Councilman, John Inks would not be able to finish out his Advisory Council term.

Ms. Knudsen also stated that Caltrans recently announced the fiscal year 09-10 round of federal and state planning grants. Applications are due to Caltrans on April 1, 2009. She noted that in the past, MTC is willing to sponsor applications by agencies and organizations ("sub-applicants") that are not otherwise eligible to submit applications on their own. It was pointed out that if agencies are interested in having MTC sponsor them, they need to notify MTC by February 2. Please contact Carolyn Clevenger ([cclevenger@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:cclevenger@mtc.ca.gov), 510-817-5736) should you have questions about working with MTC to submit a grant application.

**Report from the Minority Citizens Advisory Committee (MCAC);**  
**Report from the Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC)**

No reports. January meetings for both committees were cancelled.

**TOD Choices**

Since the full PowerPoint presentation was made to the committee in December, 2008, Ms. Valerie Knepper briefly summarized the eight market segments.

Committee comments included:

- Where do people who consider themselves transit dependent fit in these segments? Response: They would likely fit into the “transit preferring” segment, which cares a lot about transit accessibility.
- Regarding Segment 3 – Kids, Cars & Schools: most people that have kids and go to daycare value the car because that is how they get there and back. Children are their priority, and the car becomes their second priority.
- Why isn’t there a 9<sup>th</sup> market segment for Business/Industry? Response: The study is focused on asking residents about housing vs. asking businesses about where they want to locate. Some of the questions did get at asking residents about proximity to jobs.
- Another category should be retired people with no kids who sort of can afford to have a car but want the urban access.
- Another group may be those who work at home or commute one day a week or less for their work responsibilities.
- It would be helpful to have a better description of what these six attitudinal factors mean. Response: Will be sent
- Were people surveyed through random phone polling? Response: Yes
- Cross-check data with people who actually live in TODs now for a reality check – are they happy and glad they made the choice to live in a TOD?
- Talk to people who live next to Caltrain and ask them if they picked this TOD because of the accessibility to Caltrain and transit – check to see if some of this data makes sense.
- Ask individuals if they are happy that they made the choice to move in a TOD.

- Ideas for a follow-up study – senior drivers – what are their transportation options? Do a survey in the nine counties focusing on senior communities to get feedback on if they were to lose their license what type of transportation they would have.
- Information about demographics would help tie things together
- Child care – this is a barrier to taking transit – should have included this question
- What is the intent of the follow-up interviews? Response: Look at those that are interested in TODs but not currently living there. Look at what it would take to get them to live there. Workshops will serve to look at possible policies that would make it better/easier to move to TODs.
- How larger were the segments? Response: ~900 total – the bubbles/circles in the slides represent size
- Make sure you note the differences in they types of TODs – i.e. urban vs. suburban
- Sometimes there is no transit access after 7pm – this impacts the ability to use transit at a TOD
- Did you just ask questions about BART? Response – No, all transit

### **Overview of SB 375 (Steinberg): Linking Regional Transportation Plans to State Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals**

Mr. Ted Droettboom briefed the committee on Senate Bill 375 and how it might affect regional land-use and transportation planning in the Bay Area.

Senate Bill 375 explicitly assigns responsibilities to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to implement the bill's provisions within the Bay Area. The core substance of the legislation is defined by 1) the establishment of regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for the automobile and light-truck sector by the California Air Resources Board, 2) the preparation in each region of a Sustainable Community Strategy and optionally an Alternative Planning Strategy which attempts to achieve the greenhouse gas targets though a preferred land-use pattern integrated with the transportation network and with transportation policies and measures, 3) the synchronization and coordination of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation with the RTP, and 4) the granting of limited California Environmental Quality Act relief to housing and mixed-use projects which are consistent with a Sustainable Community Strategy or Alternative Planning Strategy.

Comments included:

- Who decides all regional housing demand? Response: Currently for RHNA, ABAG and HCD negotiates a total regional housing demand number based upon forecasts done by ABAG and by the State Department of Finance. SB 375 is silent on who decides housing demand.
- Is there a definition of “sustainable transportation” in SB375? Response: No
- The data is from a benchmark of the 1990s for a decrease in the CO2 emissions – is that benchmark because that’s when the emissions started to go up or go down? Response: It’s a benchmark because when most of the work started, that was the only data available.
- For the agencies that have to buy fuel – is the fuel subsidized by someone for transportation? Response: No.

**Legislative Update**

Ms. Ellen Griffin commented on the State Budget, and stated that last week the Governor vetoed a proposal from the Democrats in the legislature, which would have eliminated the state gas tax and instead put in a 39 cent gas fee for gasoline and a 31 cent fee for diesel. She noted that the governor has released his proposal for the budget year 2009-10, which eliminates state transit assistance in the current budget year by \$253m, and then eliminates it entirely next year and into the future. He is also proposing a temporary 3-year sales tax of 1.5%, which would raise some Prop. 42 revenues, and advance some of the infrastructure bond revenues.

She also stated that there is a lot of talk about a stimulus package where staff expects to see a big infrastructure package in early spring, and there is discussion in Sacramento about how California’s revenues will be divvied up.

Committee comments:

- No one can issues bonds due to the economic climate, not just the state
- Is it legal to eliminate Proposition 42?

**Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis**

Ms. Jennifer Yeamans presented a brief power-point presentation on the T2035 Equity Analysis preliminary results. She stated that there are higher RTP expenditures for low-income households than other households; similar

or greater absolute benefits accrue to communities of concern than the remainder of the region. The Plan helps close the "accessibility gap" between auto and transit for both communities of concern and the remainder of the region - but overall autos still provide greater access to jobs and other activities than transit. There are also greater benefits for communities of concern and the remainder of the region that come from more compact land use than transportation investments alone, and combined housing and transportation affordability measures proved difficult to forecast, and may be more relevant as a shorter-term measure broken down neighborhood by neighborhood.

### **Committee Member Suggestions for Subcommittees**

Due to time limitations, subcommittees will be asked to make a brief report at the next meeting.

### **Other Business/Public Comment/Announcements**

Bob Planthold noted that Advisor Mary Griffin is being inducted into the Women's Hall of Fame in San Mateo County. Congratulations went out to her from the committee. There was no other business. The next meeting of the Advisory Council is scheduled for February 11, 2009. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.